

THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT

Vol. XV

NOVEMBER, 1960

No. 173

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL		192
WAYS MANY AND VARIOUS	Roland Potter	193
FAITH AND THE SACRAMENT OF FAITH	Paulinus Milner	200
SPIRITUAL DIRECTION	Fr William, O.C.D.	208
BL. RICHARD REYNOLDS	S.M.D.	217
GAMALIEL (A conversation)		223
REVIEWS		230

Contributors are encouraged to submit original MSS. or translations from the Fathers. *Literary Communications* to be addressed to The Editor, The Life of the Spirit, Blackfriars, Cambridge (Tel. 51514). The Editor cannot be responsible for the loss of MSS. submitted, and no MS. will be returned unless accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope. *Subscriptions, Orders and Communications* regarding *Advertisements* should be addressed to the Manager, Blackfriars Publications, 34 Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1 (Museum 5728). Annual Subscription 30s. od. (\$4.50) post free. *Binding: Orders and Enquiries* for binding volumes of the review may be sent to the Kemp Hall Bindery, 33 St Aldate's, Oxford.

EDITORIAL

THE editorship of THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT is being taken over this month by Fr Laurence Bright, o.p. The editorial address will be *Blackfriars, Cambridge*, from now on. The first issue edited by Fr Laurence will appear in January, and the retiring editor's last number will be next month's. He would like to thank his contributors for their co-operation and the patience with which they have borne his chivvy. He has personally found his two years of editing a valuable and enjoyable experience, from which he hopes that readers have not suffered too severely.

We have two good causes which we wish to recommend to the prayers and purses of our readers. The first is C.R.I., Children's Relief International, a voluntary organization to help deprived children of any nationality, by building homes in each of which twelve children are cared for in a family atmosphere. The first home is being opened this year at Shooters Hill for twelve boys from D.P. camps in Germany, Austria and Italy. C.R.I. say that they intend to specialize in the little devils who give infinite trouble. Each child, it is estimated, will cost about £250 a year. For information about how you can help write to *Mr Bruce Duncan, 4 Harvey Road, Cambridge*.

Our second good cause is a work of piety which should make an appeal to the whole Christian world. It is the completion of a basilica on the Mount of Olives, on the site where Constantine built a great church in honour of our Lord's ascension and return in glory, which was known in antiquity as the Eleona. The new basilica, planned to reproduce the original one as closely as possible, was begun as long ago as 1920, but was interrupted by the war and subsequent upheavals in Palestine. It is dedicated to the Sacred Heart and to the cause of spreading the peace of Christ among the nations. To help the work an Association of the Friends of Eleona was established in 1956. For further information write to its headquarters at *13 rue de la Dalbade, Toulouse, France*.

The theme which we wish to suggest to readers' thoughtful consideration in this number is *Revelation*. It is of the essence of Christianity that it is a revealed religion. The importance of revelation is not simply that we are told things by God which we

could not have found out ourselves, but that a personal relationship is established between God and men. God talks to us, and we talk to him. Revelation is the divine overtures in establishing friendship between God and men, concord between heaven and earth. One of the subsequent articles tells us something of God's infinite patience and tact in the approaches he has made to men in the course of history. The story of his revelation is contained in the Bible; no means were too trivial or petty for God to use, provided they were successful in establishing *contact* between himself and his people, until the whole process was completed, the friendship sealed, by the incarnation. Another article is concerned with man's answer to God's revelation—that is, with faith. The third article, on spiritual direction, may be said to deal with the arduous task of keeping up the contact, of making the revelation-faith conversation between God and us a lifelong and living affair, that will reach its apogee in the face-to-face colloquy of heaven.



WAYS MANY AND VARIOUS

ROLAND POTTER, O.P.

God who spoke to our forefathers, through the prophets, in ways many and various, has at last, in these days, spoken to us through his Son . . .

(Hebr. i, 1).

WITH these impressive words begins the epistle to the Hebrews, and we are taught that God it is who commands all history, and God who reveals himself by speaking through all the sacred history of Israel as also to the new Israel of God or body of Christ. The stress in the text is first of all on God who has all the initiative, and who brings about a continuity in old and new testament covenants because the same loving God brought all essential history to its real conclusion in the revelation of a Saviour who is Lord of all.

Our text also speaks of *ways many and various*.¹ Two points are made: the frequency of God's utterance, and the variety of ways in which his message comes to the world. Let us try to illustrate that frequency and the many ways and modes.

We who live in a spiritual climate of faith-once-delivered and of faithful adherence to the infinitely precious deposit of faith, need also from time to time to reflect on God who spoke progressively, over long centuries, through the prophets.

Progressive revelation among the chosen people was closely woven into a long-drawn yet formative historical process. Constant speaking to the prophets led to the moulding of God's people. But the very constancy of utterance meant that each revelation was somehow incomplete, calling for more. Such was the very character and condition of revelation in the old testament. Surprisingly enough, Osee, one of the earliest writing prophets, had a sense of the multiplicity of God's utterances:

*I spoke to the prophets,
it was I who multiplied visions,
and through the prophets gave parables.* (Osee xii, 10.)

There were perhaps a thousand years of history in which God spoke again and again to the chosen people. Later in that history, a good Jew could have a sense of that whole process and come to write:

Happy are we, O Israel,

for what is pleasing to God is revealed to us! (Baruch iv, 4.)

This is the happy exclamation of a believer and theologian: it can be ours too. Theological too is the viewpoint of Deuteronomy and the deuteronomical history of Israel which has come down to us. This enables us to judge of the type of writing and to read more understandingly. But the Bible also tells us frankly of primitive states of mind as of infidelities and of compromises with infidelity, for God's word came into a world blind to the true and living God of Israel. The chosen people were always surrounded by pagan usages and often affected by them. The law was clearly against recourse to false gods or pagan divination.

'these nations whose land thou shalt possess hearken to soothsayers and diviners: but thou art otherwise instructed by the Lord thy God' (Deuter. xviii, 14).

¹ *Polumeros kai polutropos*: a conjunction of terms only found elsewhere in Maximus of Tyre, second century A.D.

The ideal was there, yet there were many Canaanite infiltrations in Israel's thought and worship; and the pagan hold on the leaders of the people as on the mass of the people was long and tenacious. In early days Saul, we are told, had rooted out magicians and soothsayers from the land (I Kings (Sam.) xxviii, 9); yet the story shows that he knew where they were, and he himself, when forced by the inexorable silence of God, did not hesitate to play with fire and call upon the witch of Endor and the ghost of Samuel, only to hear his own doom. Later in Hebrew tradition Ecclesiasticus interpreted the fascinating story as the last good deed of the prophet Samuel:

'He made known to the king and showed him the end of his life: and he lifted up his voice from the earth in prophecy to blot out the wickedness of the nation' (Eccles. xlvi, 23).

Certainly consulting or calling up of the dead seems to have persisted in Israel, together with kindred rites. Thus Isaias refers to those who would 'seek of pythons and diviners and mutter in their enchantments' (Isaias viii, 19). Manasses, whose very long reign seems to have been devoted to all manner of anti-Yahwistic practices, 'used divinations, observed omens, and appointed pythons, and multiplied soothsayers to do evil before the Lord to provoke him' (IV (II) Kings xxi, 6). Josias, the reforming king after him, strove to rid the land of all such things (IV (II) Kings xxiii, 24).

Rhabdomancy, or divining by a piece of wood, can be found in Osee iv, 12:

*My people have consulted their stocks
and their staff has enlightened them.*

Some implication of this sort, it can reasonably be argued, is in the very old 'Song of the Well' preserved in Numbers xxi, 18; for we are told that the leaders and chieftains were there 'with sceptres and sticks'. The reference may be to a water-divining ceremony; and water-divining, even in the twentieth century A.D., is done with sticks.

These and like practices are all concerned with getting something from God or getting to know however crudely about God. There is a primitive inquisitiveness intent on signs and portents which reveals the state of Hebrew society before and apart from the schooling of the prophets. Thus, for example, Gedeon is the recipient of a *sign* from God—'by the three hundred men that

lapped water I will save you and deliver Midian into your hand' (Jud. vii, 7); and he learned from a dream and its interpretations: 'and when Gideon had heard the dream and the interpretation thereof, he adored . . . and he said, Arise, for the Lord has delivered the camp of Midian into our hands'. Another primitive passage verges on 'tempting God' were it not for Gideon's prayer, 'Let not thy wrath be kindled against me if I try once more, seeking a sign in the fleece', and, we are told, 'God did that night as he had requested' (Jud. vi, 39 & 40).

From an early period, too, priests were to give oracles or answers of God. Already in the desert period Moses was thus consulted, 'the people come to me to seek the judgment of God' (Exod. xviii, 15), and Moses was exhorted: 'be thou to the people in those things that pertain to God, to bring their words to him' (Exod. xviii, 19)—wording which came to be incorporated in the virtual definition of the priesthood in Hebrews v, 1. These texts of Exodus, together with Numbers xii, 8, belong to the oldest tradition which brings out the role of the covenant-tent in the consultation of the Lord. The people would approach the tent wherein Moses alone spoke to God 'face to face as a man is wont to speak to his friend' (Exod. xxxiii, 11). Significantly, centuries later, St John was to write how the Word of God 'pitched his tent' among us (John i, 14).

At an early period too, priests 'consulted the Lord' by the ephod and by Urim and Thummim.² 'Ephod' could mean several things, but we need only retain one sense and usage: a term used in oracular responses. A text of Proverbs xvi, 33 reads:

*From the pocket comes the lot
from the Lord comes all decision.*

The text becomes intelligible if we remember that attached to the high priest's 'ephod' was a pocket or folds containing the Urim and Thummim for oracular responses.

Urim and Thummim seem to have been sacred lots or holy dice, by which 'yes' or 'no' answers were given. I Kings (Sam.) xiv, 41-42 is the clearest text for showing the process at work:

Saul then said, if the fault is with me or with my son Jonathan, O Lord, God of Israel, then grant Urim; if the fault lies with your people Israel, then grant Thummim. Saul and Jonathan were designated,

² For these the most recent study is that of Fr de Vaux, O.P., in his *Institutions de l'Ancien Testament*, II, pp. 200-204.

and the people escaped. Saul then said: Cast lots between me and my son Jonathan; and Jonathan was indicated. (cf. also I Kings (Sam.) xxiii, 9-12.)

In I Kings (Sam.) xiv, 18-19 Saul is eager to know whether he should attack the Philistine camp. The consultation drags on, and Saul grows impatient, saying to the priest 'withdraw your hand'. Sometimes a decision was refused: perhaps the two lots came out together or not at all.

Anyway, there is no evidence for the use of such consultation after the time of David. The primitive drawing of lots made way for the consultation of the Lord through the prophets.

Dreams and dream-communications obtained at an early period as well as later. A dream could be represented as a favour of God, as in the Jacob story, 'truly God is in this place and I knew it not . . .' (Gen. xxviii, 11-16). Joseph in a dream is told of his future greatness (Gen. xxxvii, 9). Solomon is specially favoured with an apparition and utterance of the Lord God at Gabaon (III (I) Kings iii, 5-15). We are told that 'he awakened and perceived it was a dream'; yet he knew that God had spoken to him for 'when he was come to Jerusalem he stood before the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and offered holocausts and sacrificed victims of peace-offerings . . .'.

Dreams however were not all from God, and there was a period in which dreams were associated with false prophets,

who seek to make my people forget my name through their dreams, which they tell every man to his neighbour: as their fathers forgot my name for Baal (Jer. xxiii, 27). Have you not seen a vain vision, and spoken a lying divination? (Ezech. xiii, 7).

And Zacharias refers to the dreamers 'who have spoken vanity' (x, 2).

After the exile there seems to have been a rehabilitation of the dream as a communication from God, as in the famous prophecy of Joel iii, 1, cited by St Peter (Acts ii, 16). In the new testament period it was generally recognized that God could and did speak in dreams, as in the dream of St Joseph (Matt. i, 20).

Also of a primitive period are presages or signs. Thus in I Kings (Sam.) xiv, 8-12, especially verse 10, the first word uttered by the Philistines becomes a good omen: 'this shall be a sign unto us', and they go up to defeat their enemies. So too Abraham's

servant fixes upon a sign whereby he can come to recognize the bride destined for Isaac.

Now therefore, the maid to whom I shall say: Let down thy pitcher that I may drink: and she shall answer, Drink, and I will give thy camels drink also: Let it be the same whom thou has provided for thy servant Isaac (Gen. xxiv, 14).

The origins of prophecy proper are lost in the far past. Certainly Israel was always conscious of God's intervention, and God gave answers and communicated messages long before the writing prophets whose works we have in our scriptures. As we have seen already, God gave replies to questionings and oracles. There is further evidence of this, e.g. Jud. i, 1-2: 'Who shall go up before us against the Canaanite and shall be the leader of the war? and the Lord said: Juda shall go up.' In another story God reveals where Saul lies hid: 'Behold he is hidden at home' (I Kings (Sam.) x, 22). Later David 'consulted the Lord saying, Shall I go up into one of the cities of Juda? and the Lord said to him, Go up . . . and into Hebron' (II Kings (Sam.) ii, 1). These are apparently all answers of God who has been consulted.

We now come to a higher level. No longer now man's questionings and cravings, but instead we discern God's choices and free gifts. Thus divine messages are given to those who have not sought them, as in the story of the birth of Samson (Jud. xiii). We read 'the angel of the Lord appeared to her' (3), 'thou shalt conceive and bear a son' (5), 'that the man of God may come again and teach us what to do' (9): all texts which appear to be echoed in the gospel story of the annunciation. God's call now makes vocational prophets. Some may have in past protested or resisted, as with Amos who asserted he was neither prophet nor son of a prophet or Jeremias who pleaded he was not adequate to the task. Yet both did God's work and remained faithful to the end.

God further commissions prophets to convey messages to others or to act as intermediaries. Thus Samuel comes between the wrath of God and the house of Heli (I Kings (Sam.) iii). A 'man of God' comes to Heli and gives him God's message (I Kings (Sam.) ii, 27). Nathan has messages from God for David: David is not to build the temple, that is left to Solomon (II Kings (Sam.) vii, 4); and he is reproved for having taken Urias' wife (II Kings (Sam.) xii, 1-15). Achias is yet another. He predicts the

rending of the kingdom, and by the vivid action of tearing his cloak (or 'overcoat') into twelve parts perhaps thought that he was setting afoot the process of division (III (I) Kings xi, 30-31).

There is no transitional prophetic writing in our scriptures. The earliest writing prophets, Amos and Osee, are fully prophets, 'every inch of them'. Thus Amos speaks in the characteristic way: 'these things the Lord showed to me' (Amos vii, 1 and 7, viii, 1), for the prophets present themselves as hearers of God's word or recipients of what he has shown (cf. Isaías viii, 1, 5, 11, or Jeremias iii, 6 and 11, etc.). Sometimes a kind of dialogue is suggested between the prophet and God, as in the magnificent chapter, Jeremias xiv, which is a penitential pleading with God, a communication and dialogue or exchange. We begin to grasp that prophecy is a sort of participation in the very knowledge of God. The prophet is convinced of speaking God's words for God. Their many 'conversations with God' are expressed by phrases as 'The word of God came to me' (Jerem. ii, 1: xvi, 1) or 'when the Lord began to speak to Osee, the Lord said to Osee . . .' (Osee i, 1). Prophets thus privileged to hear the words of God could have but one desire: to communicate the lovable word to others. Hence much earnest pleading. Time and again we read: 'Yahweh says' . . . 'Listen! the Lord says . . .' (Isaias i, 2; Amos iii, 1, etc.); and indeed sometimes, simply, 'Listen to this . . .' (Isaias xlviii, 1) when the prophet so identifies himself with God's utterance that what he says is what God says. There are other phrases too, especially the solemn asseveration 'Utterance or Oracle of the Lord' (*Ne'um Yhwh*): God is, as it were, speaking emphatically at such moments (cf. Isaias xix, 4, Jerem. ii, 19, etc.). The new testament parallel is when our Lord says 'Amen, amen I say to you. . . .

Thus there are innumerable utterances of God in the ancient scriptures. Their most sublime expression is in the prophetic writings. The epistle to the Hebrews has taught us that God spoke 'through the prophets'. They alone, under God, purified the religious instincts and cravings of the Hebrew people, and prepared them for the God-given truth which was to prelude God's greatest gift of his Son, our Redeemer. By taking the messianic prophecies alone, we can get this portrait of our Lord: he will be born at Bethlehem, of David's family, and of a maiden-mother. He will have special relationships with his heavenly Father who

will call him 'My Son'; and he will have titles as Counsellor, Strong God, Prince of peace. The Holy Spirit will come upon him, with many gifts, to found a kingdom of justice and to further utter peace. The role of Messias will begin near the Sea of Galilee, and spread to the limits of earth. He will be king and priest, with a universal kingship 'not of this world': with a priesthood of another order (Melchisedech) perfect and eternal. Triumph of the kingdom will not be without struggles, yet the Messias will free the human race from sin and the devil's power. He will take upon himself the iniquities of all; he will be mocked, condemned (though innocent), and despised. He will die to expiate the sin of the whole human race. Yet will he rise again from the tomb, and will have the great spiritual posterity of all those who are sanctified by his voluntary oblation of self. He will triumph over all enemies and for ever sit at the right hand of God.

Such is a picture built up from many particular prophecies of the old testament. God's way of teaching was gradual, and proportioned to the chosen people's capacities and weaknesses. And we now are the happy ones to whom 'God has spoken in these days through his Son'; and our Lord has said:

Many prophets and kings have desired to see the things that you see and have not seen them . . . (Luke x, 24).



FAITH AND THE SACRAMENT OF FAITH¹

PAULINUS MILNER

AND he said to them: "Go out over the whole world and preach the gospel to the whole of creation. He who believes and is baptized will be saved; he who refuses to believe will be condemned" (Mark xvi, 15). Our Lord shows us in these words that there are three stages on the way of salvation. First there must be preaching: the good news of salvation through Jesus Christ must be proclaimed to all creation; the revelation made to prophets and apostles must be passed on by preachers to all human beings. But God's revelation demands response on the

¹ For many of the ideas used in this article, I am indebted to the excellent book by Fr T. Camelot, O.P., *Spiritualité du Baptême*, in the collection 'Lex Orandi' no. 30 (Cerf, 1960).

part of man. That response is faith. God has taken the initiative: he has revealed himself to us and sent his only-begotten Son to die for our sins, that we may be saved; but as St Augustine says, 'God who made you without your assistance, will not save you without your co-operation'. In response to his initiative he requires our faith. We have to pay him the homage of believing what we can have no proof of; we have to give the consent of our minds, not because we see that it cannot be otherwise, but because we know that it is good to believe God. 'He who believes . . . will be saved; he who refuses to believe will be condemned.'

Faith is our response to God's revelation, and yet the very fact that we believe is itself a gift of God. No human mind could give absolute and unswerving consent to the truths of God except by God's gift. Seen from this angle, faith is already the beginning of salvation. As the epistle to the Hebrews tells us: 'Faith is the guarantee of the things we hope for, the conviction of things not seen' (xi, 1). By believing in God we are already enjoying a foretaste of that knowledge, that vision of him, that will make us happy in eternity. Our faith is not just a recitation of formulas: it is the acceptance of the word of God on the authority of God; it is an adhesion to the Truth of God—that is to the person of God the Truth, the person of Christ who is the Word of God. 'What is it to believe in God?' asks St Augustine, and he answers, 'It is by believing to love him, by believing in him to delight in him, to go to him by believing in him and to be incorporated among his members' (*Tract. in Joann.* 29, 6; P.L. 35, 1631). This faith, the faith that lives by charity, is an intimate relationship that unites us to the person of Christ. As we learn from the gospel of St John, to believe in Christ is to go to him and to walk with him (cf. vi, 66). To believe is to become a son of God; 'To those that received him, to them he gave the power to become the sons of God, to them that believe in his name' (John i, 12); and again: 'All are sons of God by faith in Jesus Christ' (Gal. ii, 20). In the turning of the soul towards God, moved by grace and stirred by preaching, faith is primary.

But besides faith the text with which we began also mentions baptism: 'He who believes and is baptized shall be saved'.² Faith and baptism are very closely connected; so much so that baptism

² The question of the salvation of men who, through no fault of their own, do not come into contact with the Church, does not concern us here.

is called the sacrament of faith. The religion of Christ, the Word of God, is above all an interior religion 'in spirit and truth', and therefore the interior adhesion of faith is primary. But because it is the religion of the Word *incarnate*, it cannot remain purely interior, a solitary and silent adhesion of the spirit alone. It was by becoming flesh that Christ saved us. It is through contact with the flesh of Christ that the spirit receives grace. 'And he put his fingers into his ears, and spat, and touched his tongue; then he looked up to heaven and sighed; Ephpheta, he said (that is, Be opened)' (Mark vii, 33). So he acted once through his sacred body, and though he is no longer with us in the same way as he was then, the power of his sacred flesh yet reaches us to heal us. We cannot now touch the hem of his garment, but we can make contact with him in a certain way through the sacraments. These are so many sacred and meaningful signs through which passes all the power of that sacred humanity which is the instrument of the divinity. In these humble symbolic actions our faith encounters Christ in a concrete and physical manner. St Thomas Aquinas expresses this truth in a striking sentence: *Virtus passionis Christi copulatur nobis per fidem et fidei sacramenta*; the power of Christ's passion is coupled on to us by faith and the sacraments of faith (*Summa Theol.* IIIa, q. 62, a. vi). The Christian dispensation is not only a spiritual dispensation but also in a way a physical one. Christ has disposed things in this way because man is not a disembodied spirit but a complex of mind and matter. Not only faith but also the sacraments of faith are necessary to salvation.

'Faith and baptism', as St Basil tells us, 'are two inseparable and interdependent means of salvation. Faith is completed in baptism, and baptism is founded upon faith; both are accomplished by the invocation of the same names. We believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, and we are baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. First comes the profession of faith that leads to salvation, then comes baptism that seals our self-commitment.' (*De Sancto Spiritu* 12, 28. P.G. 32, 117.) Basil is here referring to the ceremony of baptism. When after long weeks of preparation and instruction the catechumen stands at last in the baptistry, he is asked first: 'Do you believe in God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth?', and he replies: 'I believe'. 'Do you believe in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord who was born and suffered?', and

he replies: 'I believe'. 'Do you believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body and life everlasting?', and he replies again: 'I believe'. Only after that is he brought to the font and baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. The ancient rite described in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus of Rome is even more expressive of this dependence of baptism on faith:

'And when he who is to be baptized goes down to the water, let him who baptizes him lay hand on him saying thus:

Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty?

And he who is being baptized shall say: I believe. Let him forthwith baptize him once, having his hand laid upon his head. And after this let him say:

Dost thou believe in Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was born of Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, who was crucified in the days of Pontius Pilate, and died,

and rose the third day living from the dead, and ascended into heaven,

and sat down at the right hand of the Father, and will come to judge the living and the dead?

And when he says: I believe, let him baptize him the second time. And again let him say:

Dost thou believe in the Holy Spirit, in the Holy Church, And the resurrection of the flesh?

And he who is being baptized shall say: I believe, and so let him baptize him the third time.' (Dix, *The Apostolic Tradition*, London, 1937. pp. 36-37.)

This seems to have been the way in which baptism was administered at least until the seventh century.³

According to this rite it is in the very act of proclaiming his faith that the neophyte is baptized. Confessing his faith in the three Persons, he is taken up physically into the mystery of Christ. 'You know well enough', says St Paul, 'that we who are taken

³ A similar form of baptismal ceremony is described by St Ambrose and St Cyril of Jerusalem in the fourth century and is found in the seventh-century *Gelasian Sacramentary*. From the writings of Tertullian and St Cyprian evidence can also be drawn that indicates that they also used the rite. There are more ways than one of interpreting the words: 'Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost'. In the Eastern Churches, however, a formula similar to the one we use now was already in use by the fourth century.

up into Christ by baptism, have been taken up all of us into his death. In our baptism we have been buried with him into death, so that just as Christ was raised up by his Father's power from the dead, we too may live and move in a new kind of existence.' (Rom. vi, 3.) In this way Christ accepts and seals our act of adhesion and self-commitment to him by making us live through him, with him and in him. St Thomas explains that although every man who believes in Christ is mentally incorporated in him, afterwards, when he is baptized, he is incorporated into him somehow corporeally, that is by the visible sacrament (*Summa Theol.* IIIa, q. 69, a.v, ad 1).

Faith is the foundation of baptism. Yes, but it would be wrong to think that it is our faith that causes the sacrament to have its effect. That the sacrament effects a divine work in us comes from the power of God who works in the sacrament using the rite as his instrument. This act of divine omnipotence demands a certain participation on the part of man, participation by that faith which opens him to the divine grace. 'Take courage, my daughter, thy faith has made thee whole' (Matt. ix, 22). St Thomas teaches that baptism gains its efficacy in the first place from the power of heaven, but secondarily that the faith of the Church and of the one who is baptized operates for the efficacy of baptism—hence the baptized profess their faith, and baptism is called the sacrament of faith (*ibid.*, IIIa, q. 39, a. v). So faith is truly the foundation of baptism. To quote St Basil once more: 'Baptism is the seal of faith, faith which is the adhesion to the divinity. We must first believe and then be sealed by baptism' (*Contra Eunomium* III, 5. P.G. 29, 665).

As we have already said, although faith is the foundation of baptism, baptism has the effect of bringing our faith to completion. Hence it is called the sacrament of illumination. It lights up the mind of the believer with a spiritual understanding. Commenting on the miracle of the man born blind that St John relates in such detail, St Augustine tells us that in this incident Christ 'sought a man who believed and made him one who understands' (*Tract. in Joan.* 44, 3. P.L. 35, 1715). That is the effect that baptism has on our faith. It gives it depth and light. We find the same teaching in St Thomas. He distinguishes between the instruction given by the catechist or preacher which, although in a certain sense it causes faith, only illuminates outwardly, and God's action on the

mind of the man when he is baptized, which prepares his heart to receive the doctrine of truth. The baptized, he says, are illuminated by Christ concerning the knowledge of truth (*Summa Theol.* IIIa, q. 69, a. v). So true is this that St Augustine can say: 'To the Church has been committed the charge of handing on doctrine, both by catechizing in sermons and readings and saturating through the sacraments' (*Quaest. in Evang.* II, 40. P.L. 35, 1355). Both teaching and sacraments are means of enlightening our minds, of breaking to us the bread of the Word. In baptism we are immersed in those mysteries to which we give our faith. We can never understand the things of God in any proper sense while on this earth, but baptism, because it purifies the soul of all evil and all attachment to wickedness that blinds it, opens the path to that simple contemplation of the truth, that affective knowledge of God, that every baptized Christian is called to.

St Cyprian has left for us a description of the way in which he experienced this illumination at the time of his baptism: 'When the revivifying water had washed away all the stains of my past, and my purified heart was filled with the pure and serene light from above; after the Spirit descending from heaven had given me a second birth and made a new man of me—then in a wonderful way doubts were resolved, clarity dawned where before had been mystery, light shone in the darkness, the difficulties all disappeared and I found myself able for what had seemed impossible' (*Ep. 1 ad Donatum*, iv. P.L. 4, 200).

So baptism is the sacrament of faith both because it presupposes our faith and because it completes and strengthens that faith. Most of us, however, were baptized as infants; we had no faith, for we were incapable as yet of any mental act, so others had to proclaim the faith in our stead. Was baptism for us the sacrament of faith? We are sometimes tempted to regret that we were not able to experience in full consciousness this most wonderful event of our lives. But we should remember that the advantages we gain by infant baptism are of far greater importance than any treasured memory of an experience. Nor is baptism any the less the sacrament of faith because it is administered to an infant. Many non-Catholics who reject the Church's teaching on the sacraments find great difficulty in the idea of infant baptism. To them, a rite which, it is claimed, works an interior change of a moral order in the recipient without the

faith of the recipient being the basis of that change, looks like magic. It seems strange to us to hear effects that are wrought by the power of God and by his command labelled as magic, since the one who performs the rite acts only as an instrument. At that rate all Christ's miracles must be called magic. We can, however, appreciate their difficulty. St Augustine faced it and solved it many centuries ago.

The Church justifies her practice of infant baptism in virtue of two principles. The first is the difference between the sacramental and the moral order, the second is the solidarity of all Christians in the grace of the Holy Spirit. Let us consider the first in the words of St Augustine: 'The sacrament of baptism is one thing, the conversion of the heart is another, but the salvation of man is achieved by both. Nor must we conclude that, if one of these is absent, it follows that the other also must be absent; for the one could be lacking in the infant, the other in the thief, but God made up in both what in each involuntarily was lacking.' (*De Bapt. contra Donat.* IV, xxv, 32. P.L. 43, 176.) The Church of course makes it quite clear that if the child grows to responsible manhood this sacrament will not avail for his salvation unless he makes it bear fruit in a converted life, but the grace of regeneration is really there and the baptized child is truly possessed by the Holy Spirit. 'Just as in a certain way', says St Augustine, 'the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ and the sacrament of Christ's blood is the blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith is faith. . . . Because of this, when (the sponsor) replies that the child believes who cannot make an act of faith, he says that he has faith because of the sacrament of faith and that he turns to God because of the sacrament of conversion. Of baptism the Apostle says: "We are buried with Christ by baptism into death". He does not say "We symbolize a burial", but "We are buried". So it is with the child. Although it is not that faith which is based on the will of believers that makes him a faithful Christian, he is made one by the sacrament of faith. For just as it is responded that he believes, so also he is called a faithful Christian, not because he consents to the mysteries with his mind, but because he has received the sacrament of these mysteries. When he comes to the age of reason he does not repeat the sacrament, but he comes to understand and willingly adapts himself to its truth.' (*Epist. 98, 9. P.L. 33, 364.*)

We have shown above how important the act of faith is in adult baptism since it opens the recipient to the workings of grace. If the personal and interior character of the relation of man to God is not to be overlooked, there must be, even in infant baptism, a more immediate connection between the sacramental grace and the human response. The Protestants are at one with the Church in insisting that the sacrament has no effect without faith of a certain kind. It is here that the doctrine of the solidarity of all Christians in grace plays an important part. It is only when it is understood that baptism is an act of the Church that we can see how infant baptism can be efficacious. After all, it is through others that these babies are born in original sin, so why should not the faith of others obtain their purification? The bond of the Holy Ghost, that binds us all into one body in Christ, makes it possible for us to answer for the infant that he believes in the Father, in the Son and in the mystery of his death to which he is to be united. 'Mother Church', says St Augustine, 'lends (these babies) her maternal mouth and mind so that they can be immersed in the mysteries, for they cannot yet with their own minds believe unto salvation, or confess unto salvation with their mouths' (*De Pec. Merit. et Remis.* I, 38. P.L. 44, 131).

The privilege it is to be baptized as an infant should never be underrated. From the time of their baptism these children possess the theological virtues of faith, hope and charity, or, in St Augustine's language, are immersed and saturated by the mysteries. As they gradually come to the use of reason they accustom themselves effortlessly to a real conscious faith and grow in spiritual understanding of the things of God. So long as their faith is fed by a good Christian upbringing and proper instruction, they should know nothing of those doubts and fears of which St Cyprian spoke. They must, nevertheless, make the small effort that is required of them. They have to make their own that steadfast confession of faith that their sponsors made on their behalf. They must confirm that renunciation of Satan and that adhesion to Christ in loving faith and they must confirm it by deeds.

SPIRITUAL DIRECTION

FATHER WILLIAM, O.C.D.

ONE of the most obvious things in the world today is the fact that a priest cannot fulfil his sacerdotal function without being a *spiritual director*. It is not enough to administer the sacraments and preach the word of God in general from the pulpit. He must convince his flock of the message of Christ by an 'I-Thou' relationship born of a highly personal commitment, which we can refer to here as *spiritual direction*. The desire and need for spiritual direction on the part of the laity has been expressed persistently, pleadingly, over a rather long period of time. It can no longer be ignored. It is imperative that all priests respond with zeal, intelligence, and untiring labour.

So many Christians have become aware of their apostolic responsibility and at the same time are conscious of their spiritual poverty. They are hungry for the things of God; they are crying out for bread and they must not be handed a stone in the form of any weak or inadequate excuse such as: 'Too advanced for me', 'No time', 'Not necessary', 'Big crowds at confession', 'Better to be just an ordinary Christian'. Now is the hour. We must meet their demands if they are to remain effective instruments of Christ's peace and power in the world. God has called them all to divine union; the Church has called them all to work—the most divine work; it is the duty of priests to help them in every way possible to achieve their vocation.

Definition and purpose

Spiritual direction is 'the delegated action of Christ for the building-up of his mystical body, through the ordinary organ of the priesthood' (Gnocchi). With regard to the individual effect of direction, one could say: it is for the formation of the perfect member of the mystical body. The fact is that the purpose of spiritual direction is to aid a person to become himself, his best self, a perfect human being; and this is done primarily through a progressive enlightenment of the mind and enlargement of the heart, involving an adequate response to God and other men.

The aim is toward knowledge of God, because you cannot love what you do not know; and it is impossible really to know God without loving him, he is so infinitely attractive. 'Whoever loves is born of God and knows God; who does not love, does not know God, for God is love' (1 John iv, 7). For St John, then, to know God is not an abstract intellectual process but an *experience* that involves all of our powers—affectionate as well as intellectual. And the experience finds concrete manifestation through the exercise of the same affectionate and knowing faculties in our adjustment to one another. The by-product, the *indirect result* of the God-ward aim of spiritual direction is perfection—the perfection of charity. When a man loves God perfectly, he is perfect.

Spiritual direction is not, therefore, concerned mostly with moral problems, but with theological problems—with the positive concern for the actuation and development of the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity. And so spiritual direction is not meant to give a precise solution to all moral problems, but to help a person come closer to Christ, the source of his entire spiritual life. Through this personal direction, one is led toward the experience of knowing God. Direction does not produce the experience, but it prepares and helps one to achieve, with the grace of God, the necessary dispositions for such an experience. And God has given the director a mandate to judge the authenticity of the experience and eventually help the person manifest his experience in everyday living.

The director is nothing but an instrument in the hands of God. St John of the Cross teaches: 'The spiritual guide of these souls must consider that the principal agent, the real guide in such an office, is not himself, but the Holy Spirit who never ceases to watch over them. He is nothing but an instrument to direct them in the way of perfection according to the lights of faith, and according to the gifts that God has accorded to each of them.' His role is not the same as that of the teacher of the human sciences. The professor is appointed to teach philosophy, literature, mathematics, etc., which reveal only the conclusions of reason. It does happen that a director has recourse to certain precedents: he learns how to pray, to discern what is sinful, to mortify himself. This is horizontal direction. It is useful, and it bears fruit, but it is not sufficient in itself. But there must also be vertical direction which considers the grace proper to the one being

directed. A delicate work! Even supposing that the continual advancements of psychology permit us to delve more deeply into the mystery of the individual, there still remains a zone which will escape scientific explanation. The director will never penetrate that zone except with the light which God alone can dispense. It is necessary that his word be efficacious; it must bring light and strength. It will have this power only if it is penetrated by the divine motion, in such a way that the action of the director is nothing but an instrument the effect of which belongs principally to God.

As St John of the Cross says: 'The spiritual director must content himself with preparing the soul to receive God. He must restrain himself from going too far and from seeking to build the spiritual edifice. This role belongs entirely to the Father of lights.'

General principles should be outlined, particularized directions given. He should not be an overbearing empiricist. He must not be authoritarian. He should show how his rules of action are based on dogma and experience, and thus little by little educate the soul until it is able to guide itself. He should take care to base the soul's spiritual life on solid doctrine and on an intimate knowledge of dogma and liturgy.

This is not enough. Principles must be applied explicitly to the case of the soul being directed. We often act illogically in our spiritual life; we hold the principles firmly but we do not correctly make the deductions from them because we are blinded by passion and prejudice. Hence even advanced souls who know the principles quite well will need direction in many matters.

Cases occur rather frequently in which circumstances make direction by letter desirable. For instance, if a soul's former director has guided it for quite a long time, he will know it intimately and profoundly, he will have adapted his direction to its needs, and he will have had proof from its progress that his guidance is effective. And if, further, the state of the soul in question is complex or difficult, and if the present available directors are quite unsuited to its needs, then it will be better if it has recourse by letter to its former director. But rarely can a prudent director propose this expedient, because to propose it might seem to be to impose it. It will be sufficient if he accedes to the request made by the soul directed.

Importance and Necessity

Pope Leo XIII declared it to be 'a common law of providence that souls be led to the loftiest spiritual heights by being helped by other men'. This is tantamount to saying that spiritual guidance is necessary in order to raise the level of the Christian life in souls, and also to point out that in the hands of God, men, and especially, priests, become instruments to produce spiritual growth in souls. 'We find at the very origin of the Church a well-known manifestation of this law: although Saul, breathing out threats and carnage, had heard the voice of Christ himself and had asked him: "Lord, what do you want me to do?" he was sent for the answer to Damascus, to Ananias: "Enter into the city and there it will be told to you what you must do"' (*Testem Benevolentiae*).

Spiritual direction frequently prevents one from merely going through the motions of religion. There are so many Christians who do not appreciate the magnificent dignity of their vocation to sanctity, to the perfection of love. There are so many who have practically no idea of the immense love of God for them, and of the personal nature of that love, and of the power of that love to do them good, to bring them indescribable happiness. The seeds of this perfect happiness, this divine life, are planted in every Christian soul at baptism. But seeds must grow and develop before you reap the harvest. There are thousands of Christians walking about the face of the earth bearing in their bodies the infinite God of whom they know practically nothing. The majority in the Church stand on the threshold and go through the external motions of religion and dutifully profess their faith. But never have they come to the heart of the Church where the living God dwells. They do not enjoy their faith, they do not know God by experience.

The Christian religion has got to come alive in the individual life. A man needs more than abstract knowledge. He needs to know God at first hand. He needs to go through the arduous process of loss and gain, trial and error. The supernatural life is necessarily adventurous, dangerous. It is governed by the principles of sanctity, not safety. One ought not to risk it alone. And it seems that nobody wants to. And so they stand on the threshold, fulfilling all their obligations but missing the joy and the power and the glory of religion. That is why G. K. Chesterton said: 'Christianity has not been tried and found wanting; it has been

found difficult and left untried'. If they would only come all the way in and drink of the eternal fountain of life bubbling up at the heart of the Church! But their cry is heard all around the world: 'How can I, unless some man show me?'

Without direction it is difficult to avoid the common aberrations, inroads, subtle fallacies: a negative outlook and approach, the extremes of Pelagianism or Jansenism, etc.; or to withstand the forces that are against spiritual growth. Alone, a man cannot ordinarily withstand the constant pressure of human respect, public opinion, or the pull toward the least common denominator, mass conformity, opportunism, the world, the flesh, and the devil.

As a rule, one needs spiritual direction for the adequate solving of problems. Without it, many try to escape problems rather than solve them, which, of course, is spiritually, psychologically, and socially disastrous. With direction it is much easier to solve problems and make decisions and thus grow by one victory after another. It is particularly necessary for assisting a person through the precarious periods: transitional stages of prayer, scruples, temptations, doubts, darkness, and crises of all kinds. It is, finally, an aid to perseverance. For one aiming at holiness, the most besetting temptation is to give up. He needs periodic checking for stimulation, correction, encouragement; above all, perhaps, for continuity—a continuous thread running straight through all moods, providing orientation and balance to one's whole life, precluding unwholesome periods of elation and depression.

St Teresa undertook nothing without direction. She says: 'Every Christian should try to consult some learned person if he can, and the more learned the person the better. Those who walk in the way of prayer have the greater need of learning; and the more spiritual they are, the greater is their need. . . . I, myself, through not knowing what to do, have suffered much and lost a great deal of time. I am sorry for souls who reach this state (prayer of quiet) and find themselves alone.' And in the sixth mansion where supernatural manifestation may become frequent, direction is indispensable.

Lack of spiritual growth is accredited by St John of the Cross to the absence of spiritual direction, 'because they do not understand themselves and lack competent and alert directors who will guide them to the summit'. This is not God's fault, as St John

goes on to point out. 'When God says or reveals something to a soul, he gives this same soul to whom he says it a kind of inclination to tell it to the person to whom it is fitting it should be told. Until this has been done, there is not entire satisfaction because the man has not been reassured by another man like himself.' A layman who takes seriously the command to be perfect needs spiritual direction even more than a religious.

St Paul went to the apostles to be confirmed in his faith. St Peter, although taught and favoured by God himself, went astray on his own with regard to a ceremony concerning the Gentiles. The Fathers of the desert, in spite of an insatiable thirst for solitude, gathered together for the sake of direction. The majority of saints had spiritual directors, and all of them had some kind of direction. In the case of some, the relationship between director and directed led to a warmhearted, holy friendship in which both found, besides light for their ascent of the mount of perfection, a marvellous spiritual enrichment and fruitfulness in works of mercy. Think of St Francis and St Clare, St Francis de Sales and St Jane, Jordan of Saxony and Diana.

Function of the director

The spiritual director has a twofold function. He is to be a *guide* and a *counsellor*. As a guide, he is expected to give advice and impart information, and it is the responsibility of the guide to see that the information which is imparted is accurate and appropriate to the individual seeking advice. His purpose is to educate, stimulate, and inspire. The guide should be able to map out a general sort of positive programme of life, he should be able to suggest the best and most appropriate and timely spiritual books to be read, he should be able to offer specific and practical ways of practising virtue and overcoming temptations. One of the most valuable services he will have to render as guide will be in the vastly important field of prayer.

So many people who pray faithfully and respond generously to the divine energy and grace perpetually beating in on them are led by the Spirit into a communion with God that is exquisitely simple. But because a new, elevated (infused) form of prayer is strange and mysterious to them a painful inward struggle and dryness ensue. This is what St John of the Cross has described as 'the night of the senses'—a period of distress and obscurity, in

which it seems to the soul that it is losing all it had gained of the life of prayer. This is more especially felt by people who have a real contemplative attitude, and whom this type of spirituality is destined in the end to dominate. It meets and must conquer many resistances in their active minds, must cut for itself new paths; and this may involve tension and suffering and apparent withdrawal of the ordinary power of prayer. Here is a point at which skilled and sympathetic guidance is of special service to the soul, which is often confused and disheartened by its own experience, its strange sense of dimness and incapacity.

People today are absolutely convinced of the necessity of a daily programme of mental prayer for the sustenance of any decent kind of spiritual life. They are learning the art of prayer, and are coming to recognize more and more that contemplation is normal: knowing God by experience, a pure intuition of God born of love. A priest therefore must be sufficiently experienced and instructed in the ways of prayer in order to perceive their needs, which after all are quite simple, and to provide the appropriate solution to their questions. He will need a clear and solid doctrine reduced to a few principles with clear, practical, incisive directives to permit him to direct souls with prudence and security in the way of prayer, and even in the way of contemplation, as well as to judge in what cases they should be encouraged to see a more specialized spiritual director. If, for instance, a person complains to a priest that he cannot meditate, the priest after a few judicious questions should be able to ascertain the causal factor: whether the incapacity to meditate be due to natural or supernatural causes, physical or spiritual, an unreal concept of meditation, sinfulness or carelessness, or finally the grace of God. The person who complains that he cannot meditate may simply mean that he can no longer think clearly about God. But St Teresa teaches, in this regard, that prayer consists 'not in thinking much, but in loving much', and that it ought to be simply a humble and spontaneous conversation of the soul with the Lord, a sort of colloquy in which one tells him freely all that he feels in his heart: his difficulties, anxieties, desires, and above all, his love for him. A worried person, upon hearing this, would begin to feel at ease once more and readily understand that he too is capable of meditating in such a manner. On the other hand, the inability to meditate at all can be very real, as when a soul feels itself in

great aridity which makes it incapable not only of producing good thoughts but even of stirring its heart; it seems to the soul that it is no longer serving or loving God. And this may be due to no human fault. The spiritual direction should be capable of doing much more to help the suffering soul than simply recommending patience.

The good spiritual director will recognize the sanctifying hand of God, who uses this means (aridity) to cause the soul to pass from meditation to contemplation. Contemplation here refers to a simple type of prayer in which the soul, instead of reasoning and forming distinct affections, feels impelled to stop and recollect itself in a kind of simple loving attention to God that is very profitable for the interior life. Precisely because the Lord wishes it to be occupied in this way, he begins by making meditation impossible for it. So when aridity is prolonged in the faithful soul and at the same time it feels inclined to attend simply to God, St Teresa advises it no longer to continue the effort to meditate, but to leave off meditation and to accustom itself to remaining there contentedly before God, loving him, wishing only to offer him the most affectionate companionship, and bearing the trials which the spontaneous movement of the imagination brings about. His loving attention to the presence of God will in time become easy and meaningful. To be able to explain this to people is certainly to help them more efficaciously than simply to recommend patience. The spiritual direction will nourish in such contemplative souls the sense of total generosity: only in this atmosphere of boundless self-sacrifice can the grave of contemplation develop and reach full maturity.

The director will also learn to distinguish the pure gold from counterfeit subjective phenomena in the development of the graces of contemplation. He must not confuse contemplation with revelations, which are much less secure and constitute a field full of dangers and stumbling-blocks. Nevertheless, it is not rare for these things to attract people and even at times an imprudent director. And so he will demand that souls in general should not place any importance upon visions and revelations, but recollect themselves with simplicity in God when they experience such phenomena, being content to refer everything to the spiritual director and to follow his orders. The director will try as soon as possible to eliminate these phenomena from the life of the person

whom he is directing; if he does not succeed in doing so, he will apply the rules for the discernment of spirits and seek to discover the 'spirit' of these phenomena, which can be either a help or a hindrance to the spiritual life: he will never permit the person to fulfil a command received through a vision or revelation, unless other sufficient motives based on reason prove the opportuneness of the actions suggested in that way.

The priest is also a *counsellor*. Counselling emphasizes the development of understanding rather than the imparting of information. The understanding which is sought in counselling is self-understanding or insight on the part of the one being counselled. The counsellor's function is to make self-thinking possible, rather than to do it himself. It involves much more than solving problems. Its function is to produce changes in the individual that will enable him to make wise future decisions as well as to extricate himself from his immediate difficulties. It aims at changing attitudes of soul rather than actions. Counselling inevitably involves personal relationships. It is difficult for a person undergoing counselling to understand why it is that the thinking he does in the counselling situation changes his life more than the thinking he does about his problem by himself at home. Actually, it is the relationship with the counsellor that makes the difference.

That is why the art of spiritual advice and every form of human counsel consists for the most part in an ability to establish *rapport*, to achieve union; in other words, to love the person concerned objectively. This relationship involves an intensely searching and probing dialogue. The relationship between client and counsellor is unquestionably one of deep emotional significance, but it is most of all a matter of the giving or withholding of the selves of both client and counsellor. The degree to which both commit themselves to this relationship seems to determine the success of the whole counselling process.

(To be continued)

BLESSED RICHARD REYNOLDS

Bridgettine Monk of Syon

S.M.D.

'... a man of angelic countenance and angelic spirit, dear to all men and filled with the spirit of God.'

THESE words, used by more than one contemporary of Blessed Richard Reynolds, suggest at once light, purity, strength; a gaze turned ever to truth, that 'otherness' which we associate with the life of the angels and which makes them so ready to give help to sinful mortals.

For what will be said about one of our proto-martyrs in this short account, I have had to rely on the research of the late Dom Adam Hamilton, O.S.B., of Buckfast Abbey in his book, now out of print, called *The Angel of Syon* (published by Sands & Co.), and on a shorter work by Dom Ernest Graf, published in 1934 for the fourth centenary of the martyrdom.

The birthplace, family and exact date of birth of our subject still evade us, but it seems to be more or less accepted that he was born at Pinhoe, near Exeter, in 1488 or 1489. These dates are surmised from records in Cambridge university where Richard was an undergraduate, and which tell us that he took his degree of B.A. in 1506, followed three years later by that of M.A. In 1510 he was elected a fellow of Corpus Christi College. There is no record of ordination, but in 1513 he had gained the degree of bachelor of divinity and was appointed apostolic preacher to the university. He thus began that apostolic work which was to make him so widely known, at a time whose greatest evil, it has been said, was the neglect of sound theological preaching.

When admitted to the degree of B.D., Richard had stipulated that he should not be bound to residence or special work at the university because he was expecting to enter the cloister by the feast of St Barnabas of that year.

We do not know just what had turned Richard's thoughts and desires to Syon Abbey at Isleworth on the Thames, which King Henry V had established in 1415 by bringing some religious from Sweden, where St Bridget had founded her Order of Saint

Saviour in the previous century; but we know that this king had in mind to have the new house one of strict observance, some of the older orders having grown lax. One of the rules of Syon Abbey was that none might enter the enclosure till after a year's noviciate in the outside world, lived under direction and with frequent visits to test the applicant's strength of purpose. Moreover, no monk might be professed before the age of twenty-five.

Something must now be said as to Syon and the life lived there. It was, like all the houses founded by St Bridget of Sweden, what has been called a 'double' monastery, primarily for nuns to the number of sixty, under an abbess, but also with a community of monks to the number of twenty-five, owing obedience to a superior called confessor-general. Both communities were strictly enclosed, the monks almost as strictly as the nuns, so that, according to their rule, when once set in their cloister by the bishop, they were never to leave it 'except in grievous and inevitable need'. They sang the divine office from a choir (behind grilles), alternating with the office sung by the nuns in a hidden choir high above the nave of the monastic church, which seculars might attend to hear the preaching of the monks—the only time they could be seen. I have thought it well to mention the unusually strict enclosure of the monks, having read in a work by a distinguished historian of today, writing of Henry V's foundation, that 'the nuns were contemplatives but the monks were itinerant missionaries'.

To return to the entry of Bl. Richard for profession on June 11, 1513. He brought with him the reputation of being a brilliant scholar. Cardinal Pole, who was to know him intimately, said of him later that 'in the liberal arts his acquirements were extraordinary, drawn from the first sources. . . . Not only was he a man of most holy life, but he was the only English monk well-versed in the three principal languages' (Latin, Hebrew and Greek). No less than ninety-four books in Syon's fine library were inscribed with his name as donor.

'I, Brother N. do make profession and promise obedience to God Omnipotent, and the blessed Mary Virgin eternal, blessed Augustine, and blessed Bridget, and to thee bishop on their part, and to the general confessor, and to thy successors; to live without property and in chastity, according to the rule of St Augustine and the constitutions of the blessed Bridget, until death.'

I have myself seen a reproduction in rotograph of the original script with the following significant words added in the margin and in a totally different hand:

‘... (constitutions of the blessed Bridget) *in so far as they are not repugnant to the prerogative of the most illustrious king and the laws of the kingdom.*’

Dom Adam Hamilton, in his book *The Angel of Syon*, had not apparently seen the original document, but only a modern copy in print of the formula of profession, when he asserted that the added words were there when Richard Reynolds made his profession in 1513. But Henry VIII had not long been on the throne and had not begun interfering with the monasteries. The marginal note was probably the result of the visits of the royal commissioners either shortly before or soon after the martyrdom of May 4, 1535. When Stokesley, bishop of London, was charged with having used papal formulae in a profession and in blessing vestments, he asserted at once that, since the statute, he had used an amended formula acknowledging the royal supremacy. So we can safely release Richard from the charge of having, some twenty years earlier, used words at the solemn moment of profession which would have been, as his after life showed, utterly unacceptable to him.

A number of years spent in worship, prayer and study followed Richard’s profession. His growing reputation as a learned and eloquent preacher brought crowds to hear him and seek his counsel, especially as the day of the famous Syon pardon came round.

It was in 1534, when Elizabeth Barton, known as the holy maid of Kent, claiming visions and prophecies from heaven, was executed at Tyburn after warning the King as to his marriage with Anne Boleyn, that attention was turned to Richard Reynolds, monk of Syon, since after an interview with her, he praised her personal holiness, as did St John Fisher and, later, St Thomas More. It ended in the arrest of them all and imprisonment in the Tower. Richard’s companions were three Carthusian monks, John Houghton, Augustine Webster and Robert Lawrence, also two secular priests, one of whom was pardoned later. The other, John Hale, Vicar of Isleworth, was to suffer with the four religious. The indictment was that they ‘treacherously machinating . . . did openly declare and say: The King our Sovereign Lord, is not supreme head on earth of the Church of England’.

The prisoners pleaded not guilty to the charge of treason, but refused to take an oath which was against the laws of God and the Catholic Church. The trial at Westminster began on April 28, 1535, but as the jury could not bring themselves to find such holy men guilty, the verdict was left until the next day, when the jurors, browbeaten by threats of what their refusal would bring on themselves, gave in.

The Lord Chancellor, presiding, addressed Richard first, and asked why he alone persisted in his opinion against the Act of Parliament, when it was accepted by so many great lords and bishops.

'I had indeed determined', replied our martyr, 'in imitation of our Lord Jesus when he was before the court of Herod, to return no answer, but since you press me and that I may satisfy my own conscience and the consciences of those here present, I say that our belief has far more abundant testimony in its behalf than yours. For instead of the few whom you bring forward out of the Parliament of this one kingdom, I have on my side the whole Christian world—except those of this kingdom; nay, I do not say of all this kingdom, for only the lesser part is with you. And were even the greater part of the kingdom to declare against me, it would not be because they so believe, but only by outwardly feigning it, for fear of loss of dignity or for the hope of winning the royal favour. . . .' Asked by Cromwell to say of whom he was speaking, Reynolds answered: 'All good men in the kingdom'. Then he continued: 'As for the witness of the ancient Fathers, I have on my side the General Councils and all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church for fifteen hundred years, and especially Saints Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory. And I am well assured that when his Most Serene Majesty shall have known the truth of this, he will be offended beyond measure with certain bishops who have given him this counsel.'

He was interrupted and told to answer the charge of having maliciously persuaded others to rebel against the King and Parliament. To this the prisoner answered: 'I tell you first of all, that if I were here arraigned before God's own tribunal, it would be made clear that never to living man have I declared an opinion of my own maliciously against the King or anyone in authority; save when to clear my conscience I spoke of it in confession, being compelled thereto. I was indeed grieved to learn that His

Majesty had fallen into so grave an error, but I said so to none, except as I have declared. And had I not then declared what I believe, I would say it openly now, seeing I am bound to it by God and my conscience, and in doing so neither my sovereign nor anyone else may rightly take offence.'

For the second time Richard was told to cease speaking. 'Since you will not let me say more', he answered, 'judge me according to your law.'

The prisoners were told what was the verdict—that they be 'hanged, drawn, and quartered'. Richard asked for two days to prepare for death, and was told this depended on the King's clemency. His only rejoinder was from the psalm: '*Credo videre bona Domini in terra viventium*'.

May 4, 1535, was appointed for the martyrdom. No doubt all awaiting it in prison had their dark night in preparation, that agony which in their measure they shared with the divine victim, and which ended with the ministry of an angel strengthening them.

The morning came and five prisoners were led out, their faces full of joy. We know this from the words of St Thomas More. Watching the scene from his cell window, he said to his daughter: 'Dost thou not see, Meg, that these blessed fathers be now going to their deaths as cheerfully as bridegrooms to their marriage?'

I suppose most of us know now what was involved in martyrdom at Tyburn for high treason. Bound to a hurdle and dragged over the rough road from the Tower to Tyburn, the victim was watched by crowds of men and women. This in London, not much more than four hundred years ago and after some nine hundred years of Christianity! Crowds were waiting at Tyburn where all was ready: the gallows, the thick rope, the ladder, the fire in a great cauldron.

Prior John Houghton was the first victim. The rope was put round his neck and he addressed the crowd from the ladder:

'I call God to witness and I beseech all here present to attest for me on the dreadful day of judgment that being about to die in public I declare that I have refused to comply with the will of his Majesty the King, not from obstinacy, malice or a rebellious spirit, but solely for fear of offending the supreme Majesty of God. Our holy mother the Church has decreed and enjoined

otherwise than the King and the Parliament have decreed. I am therefore bound in conscience and am ready and willing to suffer every kind of torture rather than deny a doctrine of the Church.'

Then praying in the words of Psalm XXX he ended saying: '*Into thy hands I commend my spirit; for thou hast redeemed me, O Lord the God of truth*'. The ladder was then taken away and the martyr hung until nearly strangled, was cut down and the last butchery began. The martyr continued to pray while the executioner ripped open his body, flinging the entrails into the fire. Then as a hand was laid on his heart, came the last words: 'Good Jesu, what will you do with my heart?'

All that has just been described was repeated four times, Richard watching and encouraging the sufferers, promising them, it is said, a 'heavenly banquet for their sharp breakfast'. Then came at last his own turn. Cardinal Pole, writing later in his *Defence of the Unity of the Church*, was to describe the last moments as follows: 'One of these martyrs I must not pass over without special mention, as he was intimately known to myself. Reynolds was his name, and he was one who, for the sanctity of his life, might be compared with the very first of those who profess the more exact rule of conduct. . . . To manifest to all time . . . his sanctity and doctrine and to show the height of his piety in Christ and his love of his country, it was ordained that . . . he should give testimony to the truth with his own blood. He gave it . . . with such constancy of mind that, as I was told by one who was present at the spectacle and had observed most attentively all that took place, when he put his neck within the murderous halter, he seemed rather to put on a regal chain than an instrument of death, such was the alacrity manifested in his countenance. O blessed man! truly worthy of the fullest confidence of thee, O my country!' (Quoted by Dom Adam Hamilton in his book *The Angel of Syon*.)

What must have been the joy of Cardinal Pole when, some eight years after writing the words just quoted, on his way to England as legate to Queen Mary, he was able to visit Syon's exiles and encourage them with hopes of return to their homeland. A few years passed, and he saw nuns and monks—if in reduced numbers—re-established in their life of cloistered peace.

GAMALIEL

GAM. I've a bone to pick with you, Ed. Within a month of your so indiscreetly publishing that conversation of ours, I received no less than eighteen questions.

ED. My—we *did* succeed in priming the oracle's pump. Nothing for you to worry about, then, for at least another year. Come and have another conversation next September. Good morning.

GAM. But I may not be here next September. I cannot be sure your successor will keep me on.

ED. No, I don't suppose you can. Well, you had better get on with answering as many as possible now, instead of wasting my time picking bones.

GAM. I was going to suggest you might help me with some of them—a sort of two-man Brains Trust; discussing the questions rather than just answering them.

ED. Sorry, old man, but *you* are the oracle. That's what you are employed for. I have my own work to do. *Good* morning.

GAM. Well, one question does concern you rather personally. 'I have been taught', says my correspondent, who lives in Pennsylvania, 'that it is sinful to take the name of God in vain; this means, I understand, using his name in a frivolous manner. Yet on page 124 of the August-September issue the editor does, it appears to me, use God's name frivolously. Can you explain to me how it is not sinful to use God's name as it was there used?' Can *you* explain, Ed.? The words complained of are: 'My God, Gameliel, if you mix such a metaphor again, I'll fire you'.

ED. Oh.—Er, yes.—Um. But da—, I mean, Oh Lor—. Well, dearie me.

GAM. Come on; was it sinful or not?

ED. No, dash it—I mean, certainly not.

GAM. You're unrepentant?

ED. I'll grant it may have been indiscreet—

GAM. Not in the best of taste, perhaps?

ED. That's arguable, though I wouldn't agree.

GAM. But definitely not a sin against the second commandment?

ED. Definitely not. Absolutely not. Your correspondent's attitude reduces the second commandment to an utterly trivial level—to use a favourite word of yours. What it is forbidding,

I would say, is the use of God's name for such purposes as magical incantations, or swearing oaths you do not intend to keep.— And I *did* fire you.

GAM. But we have our Lord's saying about idle words to show that God is not too grand to take even trivial sins into account, just as he is not too grand to acknowledge even trivial good works. My correspondent is only wondering if you may not have committed a trivial breach of a commandment, and is clearly surprised that you should have been so thoughtless as to commit it in print. ED. But I just don't agree that 'vanity' in the Bible, the idea expressed in the phrase 'taking God's name *in vain*', has anything to do with triviality, or even frivolity. It is applied to such things as idols, and the utterances of false prophets, and a worthless sort of life. We are forbidden to treat God's name as worthless, or in a worthless fashion.

GAM. Well, isn't the frivolous use of something as sacred as God's name a worthless action? Let's look at the text, Exodus xx, 7: 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that shall take his name in vain'. Doesn't that second sentence strike you as intended precisely to meet the sort of defence you are putting up, that such a trivial thing doesn't really matter?

ED. Possibly. But the text also suggests another defence. What is God's name that we are forbidden to take in vain? Not the word 'God', which is no more God's name than the words 'editor' or 'man' are my names. 'Yahweh' is the name (translated 'the Lord' in our Bibles) which the Israelite is forbidden to treat as worthless or cheap.

GAM. If you interpret the commandment as strictly as that, it will make it as obsolete as the name 'Yahweh' itself for the modern Christian.

ED. No. I am merely saying that the commandment, as it stands, is concerned with proper reverence for God's *personal* name, and that the word 'God' is not his personal name. The Israelites, at least of the later post-exilic period, came to treat the name 'Yahweh' with what I think we can call such exaggerated reverence that they never pronounced it at all, but said 'Adonai' (Lord) instead, whenever they read the sacred name in the text. Hence our translations, and God's loss of a personal proper name. GAM. But then the new testament has practically transferred the

title 'Lord' to *our* Lord, who certainly has got a proper personal name.

ED. Quite. And I would say that the reverence which the Israelites were commanded to have for the name 'Yahweh' has been transferred by Christians to the name of 'Jesus'. Jesus is our Yahweh. His name is the name of the Lord our God incarnate.

GAM. So if instead of using the phrase 'my God' in the way you did, you had used the name of Jesus, you agree that it would have been irreverent, and a breach of the commandment?

ED. Yes, certainly. That would, I feel, have been cheapening something personally dear, something sacred in itself.

GAM. Whereas the word 'God', as distinct of course from God himself, is not specially sacred or holy, any more than the word 'holy' is itself a holy thing.

ED. Precisely.

GAM. Well, that's that question settled. Personally, I acquit you. Here's the list of questions. Pick another.

ED. I suppose I am committed to your Brains Trust now. This one looks fairly easy. 'Why does St Paul, writing to Timothy, say that money is the root of all evil?'

GAM. From a convent of Dominican nuns who sent seven questions in all.

ED. They are obviously probing for the chink in your armour.

GAM. I suppose one assumption at least that prompts the question is that the basic sin, according to the central core of theological tradition, is pride.

ED. And another would be that in itself money, like anything else that exists, is a good thing, and its possession morally neutral.

GAM. The difficulty there is easily answered, because what the Apostle actually says is '*Love* of money is the root of all evils'. If I am not mistaken, it was a popular music-hall song of some years ago that misquoted his words in the form of the Sisters' question.

ED. Glory be to God!—That's not taking his name in vain, is it?—Evidently a nun who has shaken the dust of the boards off her feet. To deal with the difficulty raised by the first assumption, though, we had better examine the context of St Paul's remark.

GAM. Yes, of course. I Timothy vi, 10, the reference is. We might get over the difficulty by observing that in the original Greek the definite article does not appear where the English puts

it, and does appear where it is not used in the English. Literally translated it runs: 'For root of all the evils is money-love'. So perhaps St Paul is only saying that this vice is *a* root of all the evils he is considering here, not *the* (one and only) root of all evils whatsoever.

ED. No, that's just quibbling. No two languages use the definite article in the same way. But St Paul is clearly not writing Timothy a systematic treatise of moral theology, with the vices appropriately graded in order of magnitude and mutual causality. He happens to be talking about attitudes to money-making and wealth. Some people, he says in verse 5, think gain equals godliness; whereas in fact godliness with contentment equals great gain. And actually the desire for riches involves men in serious losses, spiritual losses of all sorts. As a matter of practical experience it is the root of all the ills of the men affected by it, because it jeopardizes their salvation, entangling them in harmful desires, plunging them in destruction and perdition, involving them in loss of faith and many sorrows. He is making a practical observation, not laying down a universal principle of morals.

GAM. But the same might be said of all the moral teaching of scripture almost without exception. *Ecclesiasticus x, 15* has another practical observation to make—that pride is the beginning of all sin. It is precisely the function of the moral theologian to co-ordinate these practical observations in a scheme of coherent principles.

ED. We are clearly about to introduce St Thomas.

GAM. Naturally. 'We must consider', he says (*Summa Theol. Ia-IIae*, q. 84, a. ii), 'that in all deliberate acts, such as sins are, there is a double sequence to be found, of intention and of execution. In the intention sequence it is the goal intended that has the function of a starting point, as has been stated time and again. The goal intended in the (selfish) acquisition of all temporal goods is that they should give a man a sort of private perfection and superiority. And so from this point of view it is pride, which is the appetite for superiority, that is called the beginning of sin. But from the point of view of execution, what comes first is what provides the opportunity of fulfilling all sinful desires, which has the function of a root [because it feeds the desires as roots feed a tree], and that is riches. And so from this point of view avarice is called the root of all evils.' So there you are; pride comes first in

intention, avarice in execution—which makes pride, absolutely speaking, senior to avarice.

ED. Right. Let's have another question.

GAM. Here is the *Catholic Teachers Journal* for September writing, 'It would be interesting to have a theologian's opinion on the efficacy of the mass on those in the overcrowded chairless hall, with its enormous physical obstacles to recollected prayer, who are present for the sole reason that they have been marched in with their class'.

ED. What has the *Catholic Teachers Journal* to do with you?

GAM. The editor kindly sent it for *my* opinion. Flattering, isn't it? Have *you* a theological opinion on the subject?

ED. All my *instincts* are against the church parade system in any shape or form. But elucidate the context a little.

GAM. The editorial is discussing the issue of compulsory attendance at week-day school mass. This may surprise you: 'Who would deny the wisdom of making attendance at week-day school mass compulsory rather than voluntary for ten-year-olds, and probably for twelve-year-olds as well?' So schoolmasters are agreed that experience warrants church parades for little boys and girls.

ED. 'Suffer little children to come unto me' is interpreted 'Compel little children to come unto me', eh?

GAM. That is probably a very unfair crack. In any case, the editorial goes on: 'When we come to fifteen-year-olds, do the same considerations apply?'

ED. Should religion be compulsory or voluntary? I feel there is a shortage of terms, don't you? I don't mean in that editorial particularly, but in the way this sort of issue is generally presented.

GAM. Exound.

ED. Well, there is no doubt that religion, if it is to be the genuine article at all, should be *willing*. But that does not mean the same thing as voluntary, because it is also a matter of duty or *obligation*.

GAM. Very true. And on the one hand there are obligations which a person need not, or indeed cannot, be *compelled* to fulfil; while on the other there is such a thing as the willing performance of compulsory activities.

ED. Now let's apply all this to the subject on which our opinion is asked.

GAM. On which *my* opinion is asked, let me remind you. Well

then, attendance at mass, even obligatory attendance at Sunday mass, has to be *willing* attendance, in order to be a religious act at all, having any religious value. If it isn't that, if it is just a case of the little horrors happening to be in the same room where mass is being said, then they aren't really attending mass at all, and the mass is having no more efficacy on them than it is having on other little horrors out in the playground. What efficacy it does have on them depends on the intentions of the celebrant and those who are really attending, that is, willingly taking part in the mass as an act of worship, offering it in some sort with the priest. But the physical presence of the objects of these pious intentions is quite accidental and superfluous.

ED. The priest does make a memento of *omnium circumstantium*, of all who are actually present, so perhaps mere presence does secure for a person that he is included among those for whom the mass is offered.

GAM. But the canon continues about these *circumstantes, quorum tibi fides cognita est et nota devotio*; and while the boys swapping stamps at the back of the hall doubtless have some sort of *faith*, by definition there is no *devotio* there if they are not willingly attending mass. They are simply not taking part in the act of worship, and so as an act of worship it does them no good. They might just as well not be there; indeed, they had much better not be there. We ought to avoid thinking of the efficacy of the mass as a sort of supernatural X-ray, which acts on anybody, more or less, within reach of the altar.

ED. I am glad to see you supporting my anti-church parade instincts up to the hilt. What about compulsory attendance at Sunday mass? Presumably most children of good Catholic parents are taken, or sent, to mass on Sundays without being left any choice in the matter. Would you object to their being punished if they are found to have played truant and gone fishing instead?

GAM. I would say people should only be *compelled* by sanctions to perform their obligations under one or other of these two conditions; first, if the obligatory act is of some value and significance whatever the frame of mind of the person performing it. For example, if I refuse to pay my debts willingly, there is no harm in applying compulsion to make me, because a debt paid, willingly or resentfully, is a debt paid and that's that. But an act of worship can only be performed willingly; the obligation to

attend mass is the obligation to attend it willingly. And so secondly, when it is a case of this sort of obligation, compulsion can only be justified if there is reason to suppose that it will act as an external inducement to the willing performance of it.

ED. I suppose that would be the case with young children; they are amenable to compulsory forms of persuasion. Make going to mass voluntary or optional, and they probably won't go; make it compulsory and they go quite happily.

GAM. I imagine some such experience lies behind the idea of church parades for the ten-year-olds; whereas in the fifteen-year-olds the spirit of contradiction is burgeoning strongly, and they do not readily co-operate with obvious forms of compulsion.

ED. But in all cases, you will agree, compulsion ought to be subordinated to instruction, direction, and an effort to arouse the interest of those who are being compulsorily dragooned. It is a matter of school and church authorities and parents constantly remembering the subordination of external observance to inward disposition, that is to *devotion*, and of their making their charges aware of this subordination.

GAM. Certainly. But how that is to be done I think we can leave to the technicians of pedagogy, don't you? How about another question?

ED. I don't think there is enough space. But you might broach one for us to brood over till next month.

GAM. Here's one we might consider. A lady writes from Oxford 'to ask a question which was really put by Miss Marghanita Laski in some Brains Trust on the radio. I can't be certain of putting it exactly, but she asked for a distinction between "soul" and "spirit", and wanted to know how to define "mind".'

ED. Good. In our last conversation we only considered Sir Julian Huxley's remarks about the god-theory. This will give us a chance of tackling his observations on the soul-theory of Christian theology.

GAM. It will have to be from memory, because I bet you won't have kept a copy of the relevant *Observer*. But I look forward, Ed., to a last conversation with you before you are finally fired. Goodbye.

REVIEWS

THE POWERS THAT BE. By Clinton D. Morrison. (S.C.M. Press; 9s. 6d.)

NEWLY DISCOVERED GNOSTIC WRITINGS. By W. C. van Unnik. (S.C.M. Press; 7s. 6d.)

The great question of the epistle to the Romans is so obviously the problem of justification that the concluding sections of exhortation tend to go by default: the simplest and most evident sense is accepted without the detailed scrutiny that is given to practically every word in the first half. This is true of the phrase: 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers'; this is taken quite naturally as a reminder of the duty of civil obedience.

But this is not the only possible meaning of the phrase. Elsewhere the word 'powers' is used of angelic beings, as in the formula 'thrones, dominations and powers'. Thus, there is room to ask whether Paul in this text has in mind the role of such angelic beings in the government of the world.

It is this interpretation that Morrison undertakes to expound, discuss and defend in a volume of the S.C.M. *Studies in Biblical Theology*. The work reads rather like a thesis—perhaps that is inevitable when such concentrated attention is given to such a specific point. Thus, his main point is made almost too clear, so carefully is it expounded. There is also the rather laboured stress on what is surely a fairly evident principle of hermeneutics, that great care must be taken to see what a term meant in the mind of the author and his readers (the distinction between what Paul is *imparting* and what he is *communicating* is urged to the point of boredom).

But this treatment has also its corresponding advantages. The bibliographical information is rich (though the author clearly seems to be more at home with German than with French). The arguments against his thesis are presented just as fully as the case for it. And most of all, the author has time at least to suggest the relevance of the discussion to the Christian life: for it does concern the most fundamental doctrine of the early Church—that Jesus is Lord; and it should therefore concern every Christian—it is a question of our life in the world. And it is this, even more than the actual exegesis of Romans xiii, 1-7, and even more than the arguments which the author brings to bear, which makes the book interesting and valuable.

The newly discovered documents at Nag Hammadi have given a new impetus to the study of gnosticism. Since these documents are as important in their way as the Dead Sea scrolls, it is important to have some clear idea of their nature and importance; and this service is

excellently performed by the second of the books here reviewed. Its most striking feature is the brief but admirably lucid exposition of gnosticism, in which the author manages to impose order on what is almost inevitably a confused subject.

Then he deals with the account of the discoveries at Nag Hammadi; and finally he deals with four of the documents found there. He attempts to situate each in the general picture of gnosticism; he deals with the date, the contents, the doctrine it expounds, the problems it answers and others which it raises. It is some indication of the problems which scholars have yet to face that the last book he deals with, the still unpublished *Apocryphon of James*, does not seem to be a gnostic work at all—though forming part of an undoubtedly gnostic collection.

The conclusion indicates the importance of these heterodox works for our study of Christian theology. It is a most useful little book; and a special remark may be made of the translation, which is pleasant and clear throughout.

L. JOHNSTON

ONE FOLD: Essays and Documents to commemorate the Golden Jubilee of the Chair of Unity Octave. Edited by Edward F. Hanahoe and Titus Cranny of the Society of the Atonement. (Chair of Unity Apostolate, Graymoor, Garrison, New York; \$6.50.)

APPROACHES TO CHRISTIAN UNITY. By C. J. Dumont, o.p., being a translation of *Vers l'Unité Chrétienne*, with Introduction by Henry St John, o.p. (Darton, Longman and Todd; 25s.)

In 1908 Paul Francis Wattson, an American Episcopalian clergyman, initiated, on the other side of the Atlantic, the eight days of prayer for Christian unity. Two years later, along with the religious family of which he was the founder, he entered the Catholic Church. In the future their main work was to be for the union of Christendom under the successor of St Peter.

This volume of essays contains an abundant and useful documentation. There is an account of the Friars of the Atonement and their founder, a full discussion, well documented, on the proper interpretation of *extra Ecclesiam nulla salus* and the full story of the Roman condemnation, in the mid-nineteenth century, of the unfortunate Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom. There is an account of the various Oriental Churches and their rites which will be useful for reference, while the essay by Fr Charles Boyer, s.j., gives a very good account of the growth, in the non-Catholic world, of the ecumenical movement and of the Catholic attitude towards it. A very long essay by one of the editors, *Vestigia Ecclesiae*, ends the work. This is rather hard reading, while the relevance of some

of the earlier sections is not very clear, but the relationship between the Church and the various dissident bodies is fully discussed with an abundant documentation from the magisterium and weighty authors. It will repay careful reading.

The second book under review is a series of meditations on various aspects of ecumenical work from the pen of Fr Dumont, O.P., the director of the Parisian study centre 'Istina'. Fr Henry St John, O.P., the translator, has contributed an Introduction of great value, the more so as Fr Dumont's own writings presuppose considerable knowledge of these matters on the part of his readers.

The earlier meditations follow the liturgical year, seeking to find in each mystery some lesson for those interested in the reunion of Christendom. The later part of the book deals directly with topics and problems specially connected with ecumenical work, such as the marks of the Church, faith and order, or intercommunion. As an appendix to the meditation on the Church as both body and bride of Christ there is printed an extract from Bossuet's *Lettre à Une Demoiselle de Metz* dealing with the same theme. The letter of the Holy Office to the Archbishop of Boston on the interpretation of *extra Ecclesiam nulla salus* is also included as an appendix. The only adverse criticism which may be formulated against this excellent little work is that perhaps it falls between two stools. It is manifestly not an introduction to the subject; at the same time the very nature of its division into meditations precludes a development of the themes treated which would satisfy more experienced readers. None the less, for those with some theological reading to their credit the study of this book will be rewarding in view of the forthcoming Ecumenical Council.

RICHARD BLUNDELL, S.J.

MARY, MOTHER OF FAITH. By Josef Weiger. (Burns and Oates; 21s.)

Many books on our Lady fall into one of two categories: the piously meditative, based on free use of the imagination, and the rigorously theological, based on strict fidelity to the data of revelation. Each sort has its contribution to make, but it might be better were the two not so often kept strictly apart. Something of a combination is offered us in this present volume, richly produced and of two hundred pages, well printed, but, disappointingly for such a book, lacking illustration.

It falls into three parts, the first treating of episodes in our Lady's life, the second dealing with her mediation as mother of faith, the third comprising various meditations, including some on the mysteries of the rosary. In the first part Fr Weiger bases his treatment closely on the Bible and shows a deep understanding of the events in question and of

what is implied by them. It is here, perhaps, that he is at his best, revealing very effectively the nature of our Lady's vocation and the way she met and fulfilled it. Particularly good is his account of the significance of the events connected with the birth and sanctification of the Baptist. The value of this part of the book is evidently due to its subjects having been given deep and loving meditation.

The later parts by comparison seem less successful in this respect and there is a passage also where the author has opened the door to the sort of empty emotionalism that he elsewhere avoids. A more serious criticism is that throughout the book the writing leaves much to be desired. Were style alone responsible one might suspect the translator, but often the sequence of thought itself is hard to follow. What should have proved stimulating expositions make instead a confused impression, losing much of their effect. There is so much of value in the book, however, that it would be well worthwhile to revise and re-issue it in a shorter and less expensive form.

PHILIP HOLDSWORTH, O.S.B.

ST ANTHONY AND HIS TIMES. By Mary Purcell. (M. H. Gill; 19s. 6d.)

Those who want to cherish their illusions about St Anthony of Padua and regard him merely as wonder-worker and celestial lost-property office should leave this book alone. To those who prefer historical accuracy and wish to find the real man, born Fernando de Bulhoes of Lisbon, Miss Purcell's work will be an excellent source of ultra-reliable information.

An enormous amount of exhaustive research must have been undertaken, for which future writers on St Anthony will be deeply grateful, and there is a comprehensive list of sources and their respective merits at the end of the book.

There is perhaps a sense of compression, a certain anxiety to leave no chink in the armour of authenticity and to include as much history as possible in a short space. The saint is stripped of crusted deposits of legend and imaginative hagiography, the remaining sub-stratum being carefully analysed. He emerges as a much more attractive figure than the sweetly simpering, egg-headed friar we see so often in print and plaster.

A short, swarthy, corpulent man was Anthony, silent about himself, eloquent about God; not renowned for miracles in his life-time but for preaching. A strong balancing influence in the Order of Friars Minor at a very difficult period; severe to the worldly, loving to the repentant, and without exception kind and courteous to women.

That favourite picture of St Anthony with the Holy Child in his arms, it appears in the light of research, is a figment of imagination.

If we must relinquish this and many another of our pet pieties we find we have gained more than we have lost, for Anthony is revealed as essentially a man of God and after that above all a man of the people. Perhaps this is why he is so ready to find things for harassed supplicants. Is it asking too much of his devotees to look for the real St Anthony who has been lost far too long?

P.C.C.

A LIVING SACRIFICE: A Study in Reparation. By E. L. Kendall. (S.C.M.; 21s.)

This book is a fine example of Anglican scholarship, notably in regard to the author's command of Greek and Hebrew, and we are reminded as we read it of the distressing lack of awareness in so many writers of the importance of the Greek new testament, as is seen in the notable books of Abbot Marmion and Vonier, who seemed to regard the Vulgate as inspired and textually perfect. Dr Kendall starts off with a thorough analysis of the latin word *reparatio* and the corresponding Greek words, and then examines the use of the term in both old and new testaments. Eight more chapters follow, such as reparation as a work of love; reparation as sacrifice; reparation and worship; and reparation in practical Christian living. No aspect of the subject seems overlooked. Dr Kendall has cast his net widely, and he has studied many Catholic books relating to his theme, but always with an independent mind. Thus, in quoting from Fr Patrick O'Connell's *The Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus*, Dr Kendall rejects ideas taken by the author from Fr Croiset, s.j., and expressed in the words: 'We should receive him (our sacramental Lord) as God irritated by man's sins'! Surely that sentence suggests that God is a peppery old gentleman in whose presence we must mind our P's and Q's?

Catholics will appreciate Dr Kendall's references to the Sacred Heart devotion and to the rosary; and very admirable is his use of the English school of mysticism associated with the names of the Lady Julian, Richard Rolle, and *The Cloud of Unknowing*. Many instances are given of Catholic saints and their practice of reparation, such as St Francis of Assisi and Blessed Ramon Lull. A look at the names of authors quoted reveals a wide study of such well-known ones as Prat, Poulain, Plus, Rivière, Grou, St John of the Cross, and many others.

In the chapter on religious orders consecrated to reparation it is natural for an Anglican writer to concentrate on communities of his own religion, but it is surprising to find no mention of a world-wide order such as the Society of Marie Reparatrice.

Though Dr Kendall has consulted so many Catholic authors, and has been in touch with so well-known a theologian as Mgr Francis

Davis, his book gives the impression of his having less contact with the living Catholic Church. Thus, on pages 105-6 Dr Kendall asserts that the offertory procession of the laity with their gifts 'has dropped out in the West'. That is not so. At Milan Cathedral every Sunday there is this procession according to the rules of the Ambrosian rite. At the offertory a group of old men, vested in long surplices with a black hood very suggestive of the B.D., bring gifts to the altar rails, and they are followed by old ladies, rather like nuns, who come no further than the entrance to the choir. Their gifts are the altar breads and wine for the entire week. The old people are pensioners maintained by the Canons of Milan in alms-houses.

This valuable book is meant for scholars rather than the ordinary run of readers of spiritual books, but even the less learned would derive benefit from much of the matter so diligently collected by the author and presented in clear English. Dr Kendall has a command of good English, and at times there are phrases of admirable quality, such as: 'From the day of Pentecost onwards, the fact of Christ includes the fact of the Church'. That could not be bettered.

In a theological book written by an Anglican scholar we must expect some statements we cannot accept. The most serious the present reviewer has noticed relate to the essential character of the Catholic Church. On page 26 Dr Kendall rightly asserts that the Church (vaguely termed here 'the Christian Church'—a very B.B.C.-ish term!) 'is less an institution than a living organism', but this reference to a living organism is made meaningless by two other statements: (i) 'One of the great tragedies consequent upon the fracture, if not the disappearance, of the visible unity of the Church . . .' (page 58); and (ii) on page 160: ' . . . the heresies and schisms which have fractured and rent asunder the visible unity of Christ's Holy Catholic Church'.

We must point out to Dr Kendall that the teaching of the new testament concerning the essence of the Church is that it is an organism which cannot be destroyed by 'the gates of hell'. Being an organism the Church cannot be disrupted nor can its visible unity be broken. A branch may break away from the vine, and so die, but the vine remains the vine and its visible integrity is maintained. The truth is, the exigencies of the Anglican position forces its adherents to evacuate the new testament teaching of the vine, of the body of Christ and the bride of Christ of all meaning. Dr Kendall would do well to study Congar's magnificent work, *Divided Christendom*, where on pages 75 seq. he gives in parallel columns the allied concepts of the Church as an organism and as an organization. On page vii, part of the table of contents, there is this: 'The Anglican ecclesiology. . . . It regards the Church as an organization rather than an organism'.

To end on a pleasant note: Dr Kendall gives our Lady her due place as one dedicated to reparation, and gives patristic evidence in support of that fact. In short, what a grand book this would be if only corrected in places by a Catholic theologian. We venture to suggest Mgr Francis Davis, who like Dr Kendall has associations with Birmingham University.

ARTHUR VALENTIN

AS STARS FOR ALL ETERNITY. By the Brothers of the Christian Schools. (Thomas More Books; 15s.)

According to the preface, this is an abridged and revised edition of *Considerations for Christian Teachers*. It contains fifty-two meditations on such subjects as the nature and mentality of pupils, authority, natural affection, coercion, and the virtues essential to the teacher. Each meditation consists of considerations drawn 'from the holiest sources and saturated with the traditions and skill of more than two centuries', followed by a practical application. It embodies 'almost every appropriate scriptural text', besides quoting copiously from Fénelon, Bossuet, and of course St John-Baptist La Salle. The preface suggests that the book will be particularly helpful to teaching sisters, who will find it 'a veritable *summa* of calm reflection and profound practical insight into the great vocation of teaching the young'.

In spite of these high claims the book will have a very limited appeal. The teaching religious seeking the inspiration which will enable her to combine the role of Mary with the arduous and ever encroaching one of Martha will be disappointed at the absence of a christocentric approach to her needs and problems. The emphasis throughout is on duty as duty, and *les raisons du cœur* find little place. The author takes no account of modern developments in Catholic pedagogical and psychological thought, and uses an idiom which is certainly not contemporary. The quotations range from the obscure to the platitudinous. But the book deals carefully with some practical details in the pursuit of perfection (use of time, negligence, patience, etc.), and those who like traditional French spirituality will perhaps find it helpful.

A.F.H.

MATISSE FROM THE LIFE. By Raymond Escholier. (Faber and Faber; 63s.)

The value of M. Escholier's book is that we are presented not only with an appreciation of Matisse as painter and sculptor, but also with nearly everything of importance written by the artist. Here are collected his own views on art and on his place as an artist in the modern movement. Extracts from letters and comments from various other sources

combine with well chosen plates and drawings, to lead us from the earliest days of his struggle, when he was befriended by the Steins, up to the fulfilment of his life's work with the construction and decoration of the now-famous chapel for the Dominican Sisters at Vence.

What sort of an artist was Matisse to have achieved this remarkable climax to his career as a painter? Were the four years of careful planning and design which went to make up *la Chapelle du Rosaire* merely, as some have suggested, no more than an 'artistic *divertimento*'? Hardly, for one who was able to say, as M. Escholier points out, 'I have always praised the glory of God and his creation'. Indeed there could not have been a better opportunity for Matisse to synthesise his life's work than this unique chapel.

For his life's work, as it unfolds in his letters and comments recorded here, was a search for clarity at the expense of all that was irrelevant, superfluous. In his own words, he sought 'an art of balance, of purity and serenity devoid of troubling subject-matter, an art which might be for every mental worker, be he business-man or writer, like an appeasing influence, like a mental soother, something like a good armchair in which to rest from physical fatigue'.

Yet Matisse was and remained all his life the original *fauve*, and in the paradox of the 'wild beast' who constantly *reflected* upon his purpose, we are faced with the phenomenon of a mature artist who was adult enough to be able to *play* in public, with all the intensity of the child who plays alone.

The search for 'an art of purity and serenity' served to separate him not only from his fellow *Fauves* but also from the more violent tradition of German expressionism. Yet Matisse was well aware of what was happening around him, aware too of those features in his own work which were to prove valuable for the future. 'The importance of an artist', he wrote, 'is increased by the number of signs he introduces into the plastic language.' For 'with signs we can compose freely'.

Yet the free compositions of Matisse are never mere virtuosity. The stations of the cross at Vence are the outcome of a sustained contemplation rather than sleight-of-hand.

M. Escholier has succeeded in producing perhaps the best kind of book for an introduction to Matisse and his work. Without overloading the text with his own opinions, he leaves us to discover for ourselves something of the man who was able at the end of his life to describe his work as 'devoted entirely to the search for truth'.

A.D.F.

THE MIRROR OF PHILOSOPHERS. By Martin Versfeld. (Sheed and Ward; 21s.)

'The publishers have objected that what public I may have will be diminished by my method of presentation.' They have reason, I am afraid, but perhaps the author missed the point if he restricted their objections to his stringing together old articles and addresses just as he gave them. It is the puns, the word-plays, the allusions sustained on and on and racked for a further significance that give the trouble, and the pity is that they abound most towards the beginning and the end of the book, so they will be probably what most readers meet first. But Mr Versfeld has other logic than this, even though in a gay moment in his introduction he denies it. Like the Bible this is a book which is best begun some way on: the essay entitled 'Agreements and Disagreements among Philosophers' is the most positive and the most interesting, where the dominant theme is stated which gives the book what unity it has, that it is cardinal for the philosopher to realize he is a 'being-in-situation', and that only his awareness and acceptance of this in reflection gives him the opening to objectivity: the fact that we think determines *what* we may think. Mr Versfeld realizes this has been said before, but he says it well. Many directions in philosophy are thus immediately given, and even if denied remain implied; so most of this book is an examination of varying thoroughness to test for this consistency in Kierkegaard, Hegel, Descartes, Comte, Hobbes, Hume, Nietzsche, Sartre, and Chestov. The shorter and incidental essays are more jolly and give the author more play for his style. The clue is his own admission that he flatters himself as Chesterton's *alter ego*: it may be allowed as flattery. In any case, times and needs have changed, as the author ought to be one of the first to see, and by paying heed to himself he might have distanced himself rather more from himself so that autobiographical information would be less prominent. Still, as a philosopher Mr Versfeld is good; he reveres St Thomas and understands him really well; more then the pity that, unlike him, he doesn't 'play it cool'.

THEODORE TAYLOR, O.P.